The spatial contours of wellbeing:

A content analysis of metaphor in academic discourse

The Journal of Positive Psychology

Tim Lomas

University of East London, School of Psychology, Water Lane, London, E15 4LZ

Contact: t.lomas@uel.ac.uk

Abstract

In thinking and talking about wellbeing, people often deploy spatial metaphors, such as identifying positive and negative affect with "up" and "down" respectively. However, there has not yet been a systematic investigation of how wellbeing is represented through metaphor. To shed light on this topic, a content analysis was conducted of spatial metaphors in academic discourse on wellbeing, focusing on recent editions of two leading journals, the Journal of Positive Psychology, and the British Journal of Clinical Psychology. Across 28 papers, 54 spatial metaphors were identified, grouped into four main categories: verticality; horizontality; configuration; and dynamism. Above all, wellbeing is associated with interior expansiveness, with positive valence usually attaching to vertical metaphors of height and depth, horizontal metaphors of width and breadth, and configuration metaphors of size and growth. The analysis thus offers valuable insights into the subjective dynamics of wellbeing.

Keywords: wellbeing; discourse; language; metaphor

This article explores the way in which subjective experiences of wellbeing are conceptualised using metaphor. To that end, it is important to begin by setting out an account of subjectivity itself, in order to frame the subsequent discussion.

Experiential Worlds

In its attempt to understand the character of human existence, Western philosophy has frequently alighted on a binary ontological schema (Searle, 1995). This involves the identification of two "worlds." Firstly, our inner, ontologically-subjective world of qualia, which we'll call world 1 (W1). Second, the outer, ontologically-objective world of material entities – including the physical bodies of human beings – which we'll call world 2 (W2). There are exceptions to this dominant dualism: monistic traditions of idealism and materialism assert the primacy, and even exclusivity, of W1 and W2 respectively. However, many thinkers uphold some form of ontological dualism, even if there continue to be sharp debates around the nature of the interaction between these worlds (Chalmers, 1997).

More recently though, the philosopher Karl Popper (1980) argued that it might be helpful to identify *three* distinct worlds (even if these worlds overlap and intersect). In addition to the inner and outer worlds of conventional dualism, Popper added a third: the conceptual world of abstract thought, and its products, which we'll call world 3 (W3). In Popper's words, this is the "world of the products of the human mind, such as languages; tales and stories and religious myths; scientific conjectures or theories, and mathematical constructions; songs and symphonies; paintings and sculptures" (p.144). The ontological nature of W3 and its products has been much debated – even if the terminology of a distinct "world" has not been used – particularly in fields like mathematics, where the existential status of mathematical entities is a perennial discussion point (Shapiro, 2000). It is beyond the scope of this paper to delve into such debates. Suffice it to say that many theorists argue that while conceptual thought does depend upon both W1 and W2 – in that thought consists

of a subjective mental experience (W1), and also resides in the physical architecture of the brain, and in externalising devices such as writing (W2) – it is not reducible to these worlds.

A crucial point to make about these worlds is that they intersect, and in some ways overlap. The intersection between W1 and W2 has been explored by paradigms such as the "neural correlates of consciousness" approach, a contemporary way of engaging with the perennial "mind-body" problem. For example, Fell's (2004) neuropsychological "state-space" model invites us to view W1 (subjective mind) and W2 (in this instance, brain activity) as each being a state-space of *n* dimensions (i.e., comprising any number potential of dimensions). Thus, the *n*-dimensional state-space of the mind is conceptualised as encompassing every possible subjective experience, with a given mental state occupying a "location" within this space. A feeling of pleasure, for instance, would be constituted from a specific configuration of dimensions like valence (how positive the feeling is), intensity (how powerful), duration (how long-lasting), frequency (how often it is experienced), etc. Fell's theory then holds that this mental state will correlate with an analogous configuration of dimensions in the *n*-dimensional neurophysiological state-space of the brain, in which the dimensions pertain instead to factors such as neurotransmitter levels and activation of neural populations. The model also accounts for how W2 is registered and experienced by the person (e.g., the way light-waves enter the eyes and are processed into a visual experience in the brain).

Likewise, W1 and W2 both intersect with W3 in complex ways. First, in an ontological sense, W3 could be regarded as "supervening" upon both W1 and W2. That is, as alluded to above, conceptual thought resides, or is instantiated, in the patterns of the mind (W1), and in the neurophysiological architecture of the brain and in externalising devices such as writing (W2), just as W1 itself also supervenes upon W2 (Kim, 1993). Second, in a substantive and epistemological sense, much of the "contents" of W3 pertain to worlds 1 and

2. That is, many of the "products" of W3 – from scientific theories to religious narratives – are "about" phenomena situated in W1 (e.g., subjective experiences) and W2 (e.g., objects and events in the world). To put it another way, a large part of W3 consists in the "mapping" of W1 and W2. However, such mapping is an interactive and reciprocal affair. Thus, the third point of intersection between the worlds concerns the way in which W1 and W2 influence the structure and contents of W3, as our next section considers.

Influences upon Conceptual Thought

Over the past 40 years, scholars have increasingly come to view W3 – the realm of concepts, schemas, frameworks, ideologies, narratives, and so on – as being shaped by entities and processes in W1 and W2. Arguably the foremost theorists in this arena are George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, whose ground-breaking book Metaphors We Live By (1980b) has over 50,000 citations as of January 2018. Although Lakoff and Johnson do not use Popper's (1980) three world schematic, their theorising can certainly be viewed through that prism, as we shall do here. Specifically, they articulate a position that Lakoff (2008) has described as one of experiential realism, or experientialism. From this perspective, "thought is embodied," whereby our conceptual systems "grow out of bodily experience… [being] directly grounded in perception, body movement, and experience of a physical and social character" (p.xiv). In terms of Popper's schematic, "thought" corresponds to W3, while "bodily experience" encompasses both W1 and W2. That is, bodily experience includes both the way our body interacts with the world around (W2), and our subjective registering of that interaction (W1). Lakoff suggests that this experientialist perspective is relatively recent: prior to the 20th century, theories of knowledge tended to be characterised by a stance of "objectivism." This holds that "rational thought consists of the manipulation of abstract symbols and that these symbols get their meaning via correspondence with the world [i.e., W1 and W2], objectively

construed" (p.6). However, the past few decades have seen a growing interest in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980b) experientialist stance.

At its core, their basic thesis is that the "human conceptual system [i.e., W3] is … fundamentally metaphorical in character" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, p.195). That said, it also contains *non*-metaphorical concepts, which emerge directly out of our embodied experience – i.e., out of W1 and W2 – and are defined in their own terms. Lakoff and Johnson identify three main forms of non-metaphorical concepts: (a) spatial orientations (e.g., up-down, in-out, near-far); (b) ontological concepts arising in physical experience (e.g., person, entity, substance, container); and (c) structured experiences and activities (e.g., eating, moving, transferring objects from place to place). Crucially, these non-metaphorical concepts then provide the basis for an extremely rich and complex system of *metaphorical* concepts. Such concepts also take three main forms – each drawing primarily on one of the non-metaphorical forms – namely: (a) orientational metaphors; (b) ontological metaphors; and (c) structural metaphors. Thus, with orientational metaphors, people can think in the abstract about phenomena rising or falling, for instance. These include items and processes ranging from income ("his salary fell last year") to happiness ("levels of happiness are rising"). People can also situate phenomena relative to each other spatially in ways which confer significance ("I'm on top of the situation," "she has power over me"). With ontological metaphors, this involves conferring entity or substance status onto phenomena. For instance, the container concept is commonly used to describe the mind ("full of thoughts", "empty-headed"), and thoughts themselves ("a hollow sentiment"), while the entity concept is often used for ideas ("she gave me a good idea"). Finally, with structural metaphors, relatively abstract types of activity (e.g., understanding) are frequently configured in terms of more concrete activities (e.g., perception), leading to statements such as "I see what you mean," and the invoking of notions such as "my perspective" or "my view."

Thus, it is suggested that people's sensorimotor experiences of being in the world generate various non-metaphorical concepts (e.g., spatial orientations), which then become the conceptual tools by which people understand more abstract experiences and ideas. A key point of the theory is that metaphors can only signify a concept by virtue of their experiential basis. Such bases can be rich and complex, which prevents any given metaphor having a reductive or simplistic one-size-fits-all meaning or significance. By way of example, Lakoff and Johnson (1980a) discuss how different forms of the spatial "up-down" metaphor have different experiential bases, which influences their meaning. For instance, the association of "up" with "more" (e.g., in relation to a salary) is theorised as deriving from seeing the level of a substance (e.g., liquid) rise when we add more of it. Conversely, the association of "up" with "control" (e.g., to have the "upper hand") may relate to experiences of physical dominance, such as a more powerful agent (a parent, say) standing over a less powerful one (a child). Or again, its association with happiness, and "down" with sadness, is speculated as originating in the way that positive mental states are associated with an upright, energised posture, and negative mental states with lethargy. By contrast, whereas "up" signifies a desired state of affairs with respect to wellbeing, the opposite tends to be the case in relation to knowledge, whereby "unknown" is "up" (e.g., "up in the air") and known is down (e.g., "the matter is settled"); this is explained by the idea that it is easier to locate and take hold of an object if it is on the ground rather than in the air.

Exploring the Theory

In the decades since Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, 1980b) introduced their ideas, scholars have applied it to various aspects of the human experience, and in doing so have further developed or refined the theory. For instance, many researchers have focused on the experience of time, whereby this abstract concept is primarily understood through the metaphor of spatial orientation (Lera & Michael, 2002). Thus, for instance, many languages construct past and

future in terms of back and front space (i.e., where the past is behind us, and the future in front), and sometimes also in terms of left and right. Research suggests that this metaphorical linking is not only a feature of speech, but thought itself, to the extent that people cannot help but think of time in spatial terms; psychophysical experiments indicate that participants are unable to ignore irrelevant spatial information when making judgments about duration (while the converse does not hold) (Casasanto & Boroditsky, 2008). However, researchers have also explored the extent to which such metaphorical linkages are dependent on factors like culture (rather than being universal invariants). Cross-cultural research shows variation in how time is projected spatially, influenced by cultural factors such as reading patterns; for instance, when Fuhrman and Boroditsky (2010) asked experimental participants to arrange pictures in chronological order, English-speakers presented them in a left-to-right direction, while Hebrew-speakers did so in the reverse direction, mirroring the way in which these respective languages are read across the page.

One intriguing and important aspect of experience that has perhaps not received the empirical attention it merits is wellbeing. That said, some relevant analyses have been conducted in this area, touching upon all three forms of metaphor identified by Lakoff and Johnson (1980a), i.e., orientational, ontological, and structural. With the first, as noted above, Lakoff and Johnson pointed out the relevance of vertical metaphors in this respect, with "up" and "down" associated with positive and negative affect respectively. Such observations have been corroborated by experimental work linking affect to vertical physical orientation, some of which even predates their work. For instance, Wapner, Werner, and Krus (1957) found that participants who had done well on an exam showed an upward bias when horizontally bisecting a square, where those who had done poorly had a downward bias; similar effects were observed by Fisher (1964) in related to reported levels of sadness. More recently, Meier and Robinson (2004) found evidence for an automatic association between affect and vertical

position, whereby when making evaluations, people automatically assume that objects which are high or low in visual space are good and bad respectively. Other analyses have focused on ontological metaphors, i.e., pertaining to substances and entities. It is common, for instance, to invoke properties such as light and heat, where the former is associated with happiness and the latter with anger, although there are some cross-cultural nuances here; for instance, compared to English-speakers, Chinese-speakers are more likely to reference body parts, particularly internal organs, when utilising these metaphors (Yu, 1995). Happiness is also invoked with reference to behaviour of liquid in a container (e.g., "brimming," "bubbling up"), although these can also apply to emotions more generally (including negative ones like anger) (Ktlvecses, 1998). Finally, structural metaphors include people depicting themselves as moving quickly from one place to another (e.g., "I was transported"), often doing so in ways that intersect with orientational metaphors (e.g., "I was uplifted") (Stefanowitsch, 2004).

Despite these interesting analyses, however, the metaphorical representation of wellbeing remains an underappreciated and underexplored topic. The few analyses there are either treat the topic somewhat selectively (e.g., focusing on a specific metaphor, such as heat; Yu, 1995), or refer to it only in passing (e.g., in the context of a broader discussion of the role of metaphor in conceptual thought; Ktlvecses, 1998). Thus, more systematic investigations into the topic are lacking. To this end, this paper seeks to systematically explore spatial metaphoric constructions of wellbeing, focusing on academic discourse specifically. Briefly, before outlining the methods, it is worth clarifying what is meant here by wellbeing. As a construct, wellbeing is increasingly favoured in academia as a broad, overarching, multidimensional term, incorporating all the ways in which a person might hope to do or be well (de Chavez, Backett-Milburn, Parry, & Platt, 2005). This not only includes mental health, but also physical health (Larson, 1999), social relationships (Bourdieu, 1986),

and cognitive performance (Tang et al., 2007). For instance, Pollard and Davidson (2001) define wellbeing as "a state of successful performance across the life course integrating physical, cognitive and social-emotional function" (p.10). Furthermore, wellbeing can be appraised in either deficit-based "negative" terms, or asset-based "positive" terms. With the former, wellbeing consists in the relative absence of some undesirable phenomenon, such as psychiatric outcomes like anxiety or depression. However, fields like positive psychology have shown that wellbeing does not only mean the absence of negative outcomes such as these, but also the *presence* of desirable outcomes (Diener, 2000), such as flourishing (Keyes, 2002) or life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). As such, this paper is interested in both deficit-based "negative" depictions of wellbeing, and asset-based "positive" depictions. To that end, the paper focuses on two prominent journals pertaining to wellbeing, one primarily addressing it from a "negative" stance (the British Journal of Clinical Psychology; BJCP), and one from a "positive" stance (the Journal of Positive Psychology; JOPP). The research questions are: (1) what are the main spatial metaphors used to construct wellbeing, and (2) how are these metaphors deployed (e.g., in positive versus negative ways).

Methods

The study involved a content analysis of all articles published in the most recent edition – at the time of analysis in December 2017 – of the JOPP (n = 14), and the two most recent editions of the BJCP (total n = 14). (To obtain parity across the journals, two editions of the latter were required, since each edition has only 7 articles.) All articles were examined for the presence of spatial metaphor: metaphors were identified, counted, and coded for valence (i.e., positive, negative, or neutral).

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were the complete texts (minus references lists) of 28 peer-reviewed articles: the 14 from the last edition of 2017 in the JOPP (edition 12:6), and the 14 in the last two editions of

2017 in the BJCP (editions 56:3 and 56:4). The authors and titles of these articles are listed below in table 1.

[please insert table 1 here]

After downloading the papers in PDF format, the collection in its entirety was read through twice. The first read-through was devoted to identifying which metaphors were present across the collection. In doing so, the search was for lexemes, rather than specific words; for instance, "raise," "rose," and "rise" constitute the same vertical-based lexeme, rather than three separate metaphors. The second read-through then involved counting the number of times each metaphor appeared, and identifying its valence.

The first read-through began with the first article in the JOPP; reading this through carefully, I noted down any metaphor I could identify, thereby initiating a list of metaphors. I then read the second article in the journal, noting any additional metaphors that I had not already identified in the first article, and adding these to the list. In this way, I proceeded through all 28 papers, adding metaphors to the evolving list as I encountered them. At the end of this first read-through, the list was deemed complete. At this point, I brought order to the list by grouping words thematically. I identified four main types of metaphor: (a) verticality; (b) horizontality; (c) configuration (i.e., involving size and shape); and (d) dynamism (i.e., relating to movement). Accordingly, words were clustered in these categories. Then, to prepare for the second read-through – in which the task was to tally how frequently these metaphors appeared in the collected papers – I created a detailed matrix for each category, as illustrated below in the results section. Firstly, I wanted to identify where in the articles the metaphors were being deployed. In my first read-through, I had noted that the metaphors tended to be deployed in five main ways: (a) conceptually (i.e., when discussing theory); (b) experientially (i.e., in relation to people's experiences); (c) methodologically (i.e., with regard to empirical methods); (d) statistically (i.e., in the context of data analysis); and (e)

regarding outcomes (i.e., the results of studies). Thus, I created five broad columns, one for each type, plus a sixth column in which I could add up the totals (i.e., the total number of times a metaphor was used across all these types). I then subdivided these columns further into four sub-columns pertaining to valence: (a) positive; (b) negative; (c) neutral; and (d) total. These sub-columns would allow me to register, when a metaphor was being deployed, whether its implication was positive (i.e., reflective of wellbeing), negative (reflective of illbeing), or neither, as well as a total (i.e., irrespective of valence). Thus were the columns and sub-columns of the matrices constructed. The rows were formed of the metaphors themselves (i.e., one row per metaphor). Each row also had three sub-rows, allowing me to register the number of times that the metaphor was deployed in: (a) the JOPP; (b) the BJCP; and (c) both (i.e., the total across both journals).

Once these matrices had been constructed, I then proceeded with the second read-through. Once again, I read through all 28 papers. Every time I encountered a metaphor, I placed a tally-mark in the relevant box, assigning it according to: (a) which type of metaphor it was; (b) whether it was from an article in the JOPP or the BJCP; and (c) whether it could be regarded as having, in the context of the article, a positive, negative, or neutral valence. That is, regarding the latter consideration, a judgment was made as to whether the metaphor was being deployed to indicate something positive, negative, or neutral about wellbeing. Sometimes this assignation reflected the use of metaphor in a stand-alone way, such as speaking of a person feeling “up” (positive valence) or “down” (negative valence). At other times, the assignation depended on what the metaphor was being used with reference to; for instance, one could speak of levels going “up” with respect to satisfaction (positive valence), anxiety (negative valence), or temperature (neutral valence). Sometimes the assignation was a subjective judgement call, but in the majority of cases, valence was quite apparent.

Results

Overall, 54 metaphors were identified. As noted above, these were grouped into four main categories: (a) vertical (n = 18); (b) horizontal (n = 9); (c) configuration (n = 16); and (d) dynamism (n = 11). The results matrices for these four categories are included below in tables 2-5. In terms of (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a) three main types of metaphor, (a) and (b) involve orientational metaphors (i.e., pertaining to orientation in space), (c) features ontological metaphors (i.e., pertaining to entities and substances), and (d) pertains to structural metaphors (e.g., experiences and activities, such as movement through space). These tables indicate the tallies for the number of times metaphors were deployed in positive, negative, or neutral ways, with specific tallies per journal, and per how the metaphors were deployed (i.e., with respect to concepts, experiences, methods, statistics, and outcomes). In terms of the "headline" figures for each metaphor – namely total tallies for positive, negative, or neutral valence – these can be located in the final column on the right, in bold font.

[please insert tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 here]

Discussion

The analysis here sheds light on what might be regarded as the "spatial contours" of wellbeing. Before discussing the metaphors themselves, let's clarify what I mean by that phrase, with reference to the theoretical ideas introduced at the start of the paper. Drawing on the work of Popper (1980), three "worlds" were identified: human beings' inner subjective world (W1), the external objective world (W2), and the conceptual world of abstract thought and its products (W3). Then, drawing on Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, 1980b), we saw that these worlds intersect, whereby abstract ideas (W3) are influenced by people's embodied sensorimotor experiences (W1 and W2). To translate those theoretical ideas into the context of the present paper, experiences of wellbeing (W1) are understood conceptually (W3) with reference to phenomena and processes in the external world (W2). In that respect, it is conventional to depict our inner world (W1) as some kind of container or arena, within which

qualia, and also the experiencing self, are situated. This is an instance of what Lakoff and Johnson (1980a) refer to as an ontological metaphor, i.e., conferring entity or substance status onto a phenomenon, in this case the mind. This is revealed in descriptions of the mind as being "full of thoughts," for example, or the desirability of obtaining "headspace" (Porter, Bramham, & Thomas, 2017). Thus, a panoply of metaphors are deployed to chart the contours and features of this interior "space," and the subjective dynamics within it.

The current paper was specifically interested in the way that experiences of *wellbeing* are configured and understood within this interior space. In the introduction, we encountered one very common metaphor in that respect, namely the association of "up" and "down" with positive and negative affect respectively (Meier & Robinson, 2004). However, beyond that one vertical metaphor, little attention has been paid to other aspects of the "spatial contours" of wellbeing. Hence the value of the analysis here. In total, 54 metaphors were identified, grouped into four main categories: (a) vertical; (b) horizontal; (c) configuration; and (d) dynamism. As noted above, in terms of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980a) three main types of metaphor, (a) and (b) are orientational, (c) is ontological, and (d) is structural. Let's consider these categories in turn.

Overall, there was considerable support for the aforementioned association between wellbeing and verticality. For instance, when Dodd et al. (2017) refer to people experiencing "ups and downs," it is automatically understood, without the need for qualification, that they are referring to episodes of positive and negative affect. Metaphors pertaining to "up" were on balance far more likely to have a positive valence – i.e., be deployed to reflect or represent wellbeing – often by a 2:1 ratio. That is, when recording whether a metaphor had a positive, negative, or neutral valence, the following ratios were observed: "up" (positive = 46: negative = 22: neutral = 55); "above" (19:6:31); "over" (121:68:156); "high" (269:117:57); "rise" (9:5:5); and "elevate" (353:21:4). Conversely, metaphors pertaining to "down" were more

likely to have a negative valence – i.e., be deployed to indicate illbeing – with ratios including: "down" (1:16:12); "below" (1:5:15); "low" (59:56:66); "under" (24:40:48); "depress" (78:414:46); and "fall" (1:6:7). Of course, as these ratios indicate, these metaphorical trends are not unanimous; there are numerous instances when an up-related metaphor has a negative connotation, and a down-related one a positive connotation. Indeed, differences were observed between the journals in that respect, which arguably reflects their prioritisation of "positive" versus "negative" definitions of wellbeing. The JOPP tended to focus on positive outcomes; as such, a given outcome going "up" tended to be a good thing (e.g., an increase in satisfaction). By contrast, the BJCP tended to focus on negative outcomes, and so outcomes going "up" are more likely to be undesirable (e.g., an increase in depression). However, even in instances whereby up-related metaphors had a negative connotation, and down-related ones a positive connotation, these could sometimes still be regarded as confirming the general trend (of the verticality-wellbeing association). For instance, numerous uses of the word "over" have a negative connotation, such as "overly" or "overwhelming"; and yet, their negative connotation could be regarded as deriving from the notion that something is in a higher, more dominant position relative to the experiencing self, as per "overwhelming," or something "looming over" one. Such usages still imply that it is beneficial to experience oneself as being "over" or "above" a given entity or circumstance, thus preserving the association of "up" with wellbeing.

There are interesting exceptions to the standard verticality-wellbeing association though. These can be found in the usually-positive associations of downward-oriented metaphors like "base," "foundation," "ground," "root" and "depth." In many papers analysed here, "base" featured in a positive way, such as "evidenced-based" (Wadman et al., 2017). Similarly, although "foundation," "ground," and "root" did not appear in this set of papers, these also have positive connotations, such as when a person is referred to as being

"grounded" or having their "feet on the ground." In those instances, there is the implication of stability and security, of enjoying a solid foundation. Indeed, compare that to the negative implications of up-related metaphors that imply a lack of such tethering, such as "flighty." Thus, while there may be a general association of wellbeing with upward dynamics, it is perhaps preferable if these are also accompanied by a sense of being rooted or grounded. Also of interest is the generally favourable connotation of "depth" (Pavlicevic & Impey, 2013), as in "she's a deep person." In such instances, the intended antonym is not height per se, but rather the lack of it, i.e., shallowness. In that respect, while upward metaphors like elevation are indeed usually positive, this does not necessarily imply that downward ones are necessarily negative. In the case of "depth," what is indicated is a valorisation of *expanse*: whether we speak of a "peak experience" or a "deep experience," these both suggest the value of our interior world (W1) being spacious, and possessing range, as opposed to being shallow or cramped (Wilber, 1997).

Similar valorisations of expanse can be found with the second category, horizontality. For instance, the positive-negative-neutral ratios for the metaphors "broad" and "wide" were 34:5:12 and 31:6:10 respectively. This trend is observed in the difference between calling someone "broad-minded" versus "narrow-minded." Thus, as with the vertical preference for both height *and* depth – whereby both tend to be construed as valuable – here again there is the implication that it is desirable for one's interior world to be spacious and expansive. This metaphorical trend is observed in phenomena such as the recent "headspace" meditation app, which effectively sells itself on being able to facilitate an expansive and uncluttered mental realm (Porter et al., 2017). But the story here is more complicated than a simple valorisation of expansiveness. To begin with, metaphors of proximity such as "close" and "near" often have a positive valence, with the ratio for "close" being 57:5:6. By contrast, metaphors such as "far" and "distant" tend to be negatively valenced (as reflected in the difference between

describing a friend as close versus distant). Similarly, the notion of the "centre" is often positive, in contrast to the often-pejorative connotation of being on the "periphery" or the "edge." This differs from the implication of being at the "edge" of the vertical dimension, where the idea of "peak" or "top" is generally positive (e.g., as per Maslow (1972) notion of a "peak experience"). Thus, while expansiveness appears to be valued in both the vertical and horizontal orientations, in the former there is perhaps a greater appreciation for exploring the limits of that space, whereas in the latter a more central position is frequently preferable.

The vertical and horizontal categories both involved the first of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980a) three main types of metaphor: orientational. By contrast, the third category here, configuration, primarily relates to their second type: ontological. Such metaphors are derived from ontological concepts arising in physical experience (such as person, entity, substance, container). Indeed, we already saw that the mind itself is often conceived using this type of metaphor (e.g., as a container). Here this category includes metaphors related to size and shape. In that respect, as per the categories above, there was a preference for expansiveness. For instance, the positive:negative:neutral ratios for large and small were 69:7:11 and 6:33:7 respectively. Similarly, there was a strong positive slant to metaphors of growth (59:3:10) and expansion (13:0:1). Such usages can be observed in psychological constructs such as Tedeschi and Calhoun's (2004) notion of "post-traumatic growth" (e.g., Brooks et al., 2017), and in references to the literature or knowledge-base "growing" (e.g., Dingle et al., 2017). These align with the preferences for "height" and "breadth" above. However, slightly countering the expansiveness thesis aired above (i.e., the desirability of spaciousness), there was a strong positive bias for "full" (293:72:18). In that respect, the articles tended to celebrate the idea of the mind being "full" of qualities such as hope (i.e., "hopeful"). There were also interesting nuances with respect to boundaries. As per the negative connotations of "far" and "distant" with respect to horizontality, there was a similar pejorative bias for "limit"

here (4:93:9). However, "beyond" was general positive (157:29:6), often with the implication of pushing boundaries, such as reaching one's potential, or expanding the frontiers of knowledge (see e.g., Quinn, 2017). Finally, the category also raised the possibility of worlds – particularly W1 and W3 – having multiple dimensions or domains, which was generally presented as a positive (115:10:59 and 4:0:32 respectively) (see e.g., Belchev et al., 2017).

Finally, the fourth category, dynamism, involves the last of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980a) three main types of metaphor: structural. This refers to metaphors derived from structured experiences and activities, such as eating, moving, and transferring objects. If the vertical and horizontal categories enable us to depict the worlds (W1, W2, and W3) as three-dimensional spaces, then the dynamism category allows us to imaging moving around in these spaces. Obviously, we are familiar with the idea of moving around in W2 (the external world), since this sensorimotor experience is the basis for much of metaphorical cognition. But we can also speak of moving around in W1 (e.g., being "emotionally moved") and W3 (e.g., "approaching a better definition"). In that respect, movement itself is often coded as positive – as with being "moved" – which was reflected here (47:18:11) (see e.g., Thomson & Siegel, 2017). Likewise, having "direction" is usually conceived as desirable (31:8:8) (see e.g., Fornells-Ambrojo et al., 2017). More specifically though, movement-based metaphors often map onto the "approach-withdrawal" binary that one often encounters in psychology, such as in the behavioural activation and inhibition model (Carver & White, 1994). Thus, metaphors like "approach" and "towards" were generally positively-valenced (74:4:14 and 69:18:9 respectively), whereas "withdraw" and "away" were negatively-valenced (0:8:1 and 0:2:3), as indicated by usages such as "withdrawn behaviour" (e.g., Psychogiou et al., 2017). There was also a positive bias towards active metaphors, in which there is control and agency (e.g., "moving towards"), and a negative bias towards passive metaphors, where these

desiderata are missing – such as something "getting away" (e.g., Langdon et al., 2017) or being "removed" (e.g., Dodd et al., 2017).

Conclusion

The analysis here sheds light on what might be called the "spatial contours" of wellbeing. We have seen how phenomena and processes in the external world (W2) give rise to a wealth of metaphor-based concepts (W3), allowing people to make sense of and represent subjective experiences of wellbeing (W1). With a specific focus here on spatial metaphors, 54 were identified, grouped into four main categories: (a) vertical; (b) horizontal; (c) configuration; and (d) dynamism. In terms of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980a) three main types of metaphor, (a) and (b) are orientational, (c) is ontological, and (d) is structural. Overall, perhaps the dominant theme was that wellbeing is associated with a sense of interior *expansiveness*, with positive valence usually attaching to vertical metaphors of both height and depth, horizontal metaphors of width and breadth, and configuration metaphors of size and growth. This theme was consistent across both journals, indicating its stability across both "positive" asset-based and "negative" deficit-based perspectives on wellbeing (as represented by the JOPP and BJCP respectively). However, within this dominant theme were interesting nuances. For instance, whereas there was a valorisation of limit points with respect to verticality (e.g., "top" or "peak"), with horizontality was more of a preference for central position (e.g., "the centre"). Also with verticality, while "low" or "down" related metaphors were generally negative, there were positive biases for terms such as "base." In sum, such metaphors arguably reveal the "spatial contours" of wellbeing, in that the space that they describe – e.g., expansive, with height, depth and breadth – could be regarded as what wellbeing subjectively *feels* like. Or at least, that may be the *spatial* aspect of what it feels like; wellbeing is also likely to have other aspects that are captured by different sorts of metaphors than the spatial ones focused on here, such as ones based around warmth and light (Yu, 1995).

Regarding that latter point, it must be acknowledged that the analysis here is partial and incomplete. A fuller picture will be obtained through further such analyses, focusing on other types of metaphor. The analysis has other limitations too, which would also need addressing in future research on this topic. To begin with, although the analysis offers a valuable description of the metaphorical contours of wellbeing, it cannot provide any conclusive answers as to *why* these metaphors appear to be dominant. For instance, when discussing the association of "up" and "down" with positive and negative affect respectively, Lakoff and Johnson (1980a) speculate that this is because positive mental states are associated with an upright, energised posture, and negative mental states with lethargy. While that does sound plausible, there may be other viable explanations; for instance, one possible line of enquiry could focus on the evolutionary and historical past of humankind, in which high vantage points may have been desirable (e.g., in warding off attacks), and so led to the conceptual linking of height with wellbeing. However, that too is merely speculation. Thus, further research – perhaps involving methods such as etymological analyses – would be needed to provide clues as to why the metaphors discussed above have come to be associated with wellbeing. Another limitation is that the analysis has approached wellbeing as a generic state, rather than differentiating between different forms of wellbeing; it is likely that there are spatial differences between its various forms, such as between hedonic and eudaimonic wellbeing. Future research would ideally tease apart these fine-grained distinctions. Finally, this analysis is limited to English, and to English-speaking cultures, and cannot necessarily be generalised or presumed to be universal; there are likely subtle cross-cultural differences in relation to spatial metaphor that also warrant attention (e.g., as per Fuhrman & Boroditsky, 2010). On the whole though, the analysis above sheds some light on the spatial "contours" of general wellbeing, allowing us to better understand its subjective dynamics.

References

Belchev, Z., Levy, N., Berman, I., Levinzon, H., Hoofien, D., & Gilboa, A. (2017). Psychological traits predict impaired awareness of deficits independently of neuropsychological factors in chronic traumatic brain injury. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 213-234. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12134

Bell, C. M., Davis, D. E., Griffin, B. J., Ashby, J. S., & Rice, K. G. (2017). The promotion of self-forgiveness, responsibility, and willingness to make reparations through a workbook intervention. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 571-578. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1209545

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.

Brooks, M., Graham-Kevan, N., Lowe, M., & Robinson, S. (2017). Rumination, event centrality, and perceived control as predictors of post-traumatic growth and distress: The Cognitive Growth and Stress model. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 286-302. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12138

Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 319-333. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.319

Casasanto, D., & Boroditsky, L. (2008). Time in the mind: Using space to think about time. *Cognition, 106*(2), 579-593. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.004

Chalmers, D. J. (1997). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, L. H., & Chang, Y.-P. (2017). Sport-domain gratitude uniquely accounts for athletes' well-being across two cultures: Incremental validity above the general gratitude. *The*

Journal of Positive Psychology, 12(6), 651-659. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1257052

de Chavez, A. C., Backett-Milburn, K., Parry, O., & Platt, S. (2005). Understanding and researching wellbeing: Its usage in different disciplines and potential for health research and health promotion. *Health Education Journal, 64*(1), 70-87. doi: 10.1177/001789690506400108

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 34-43. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71-75. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Dingle, G. A., Williams, E., Jetten, J., & Welch, J. (2017). Choir singing and creative writing enhance emotion regulation in adults with chronic mental health conditions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 443-457. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12149

Dodd, A. L., Mezes, B., Lobban, F., & Jones, S. H. (2017). Psychological mechanisms and the ups and downs of personal recovery in bipolar disorder. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 310-328. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12140

Ellett, L., Luzon, O., Birchwood, M., Abbas, Z., Harris, A., & Chadwick, P. (2017). Distress, omnipotence, and responsibility beliefs in command hallucinations. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 303-309. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12139

Fell, J. (2004). Identifying neural correlates of consciousness: The state space approach. *Consciousness and Cognition, 13*(4), 709-729. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2004.07.001

Fisher, S. (1964). Depressive affect and perception of up-down. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 2*(1), 25-30.

Fornells-Ambrojo, M., Johns, L., Onwumere, J., Garety, P., Milosh, C., Iredale, C., . . . Jolley, S. (2017). Experiences of outcome monitoring in service users with psychosis: Findings from an Improving Access to Psychological Therapies for people with Severe Mental Illness (IAPT-SMI) demonstration site. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 253-272. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12136

Fuhrman, O., & Boroditsky, L. (2010). Cross-Cultural Differences in Mental Representations of Time: Evidence From an Implicit Nonlinguistic Task. *Cognitive science, 34*(8), 1430-1451. doi: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2010.01105.x

George, L. S., & Park, C. L. (2017). The Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale: A tripartite approach to measuring meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 613-627. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1209546

Johnson, S. L., Tharp, J. A., Peckham, A. D., Carver, C. S., & Haase, C. M. (2017). A path model of different forms of impulsivity with externalizing and internalizing psychopathology: Towards greater specificity. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 235-252. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12135

Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*(2), 207-222. doi: 10.2307/3090197

Kim, J. (1993). *Supervenience and Mind: Selected Philosophical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krause, N., Emmons, R. A., Ironson, G., & Hill, P. C. (2017). General feelings of gratitude, gratitude to god, and hemoglobin A1c: Exploring variations by gender. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 639-650. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2017.1326520

Ktlvecses, Z. (1998). Are there any emotion-specific metaphors? In A. Athanasiadou (Ed.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualisation and expression* (pp. 127-152). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lakoff, G. (2008). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980a). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. *Cognitive science, 4*(2), 195-208. doi: 10.1016/S0364-0213(80)80017-6

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980b). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langdon, R., Flynn, M., Connaughton, E., & Brüne, M. (2017). Impairments of spontaneous and deliberative mentalizing co-occur, yet dissociate, in schizophrenia. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 372-387. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12144

Larson, J. S. (1999). The conceptualization of health. *Medical Care Research and Review, 56*(2), 123-136. doi: 10.1177/107755879905600201

Lera, B., & Michael, R. (2002). The Roles of Body and Mind in Abstract Thought. *Psychological Science, 13*(2), 185-189. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00434

Malouff, J. M., & Schutte, N. S. (2017). Can psychological interventions increase optimism? A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 594-604. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221122

Maslow, A. H. (1972). *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*. London: Maurice Bassett.

Meier, B., P., & Robinson, M., D. (2004). Why the Sunny Side Is Up: Associations Between Affect and Vertical Position. *Psychological Science, 15*(4), 243-247. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00659.x

Miller, K., Wakefield, J. R. H., & Sani, F. (2017). On the reciprocal effects between multiple group identifications and mental health: A longitudinal study of Scottish adolescents. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 357-371. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12143

Palgi, Y., Ayalon, L., Avidor, S., & Bodner, E. (2017). Changes in positive and negative affect as predictors of change in felt age: Results from the Health and Retirement

Study. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 605-612. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221121

Passmore, H.-A., & Holder, M. D. (2017). Noticing nature: Individual and social benefits of a two-week intervention. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 537-546. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221126

Pavlicevic, M., & Impey, A. (2013). Deep listening: towards an imaginative reframing of health and well-being practices in international development. *Arts & Health, 5*(3), 238-252.

Petrocchi, N., Ottaviani, C., & Couyoumdjian, A. (2017). Compassion at the mirror: Exposure to a mirror increases the efficacy of a self-compassion manipulation in enhancing soothing positive affect and heart rate variability. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 525-536. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1209544

Pollard, E. L., & Davidson, L. (2001). *Foundations of Child Wellbeing*. Paris: UNESCO.

Popper, K. R. (1980). Three Worlds. In S. M. McMurrin (Ed.), *The Tanner Lecture on Human Values* (pp. 141-168). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Porter, N., Bramham, J., & Thomas, M. (2017). *Mindfulness and design: creating spaces for well being.* Paper presented at the Creative practices for improving health and social inclusion. 5th International Health Humanities Conference, Sevilla 2016.

Psychogiou, L., Moberly, N. J., Parry, E., Russell, A. E., Nath, S., & Kallitsoglou, A. (2017). Does fathers' and mothers' rumination predict emotional symptoms in their children? *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 431-442. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12148

Quinn, B. P. (2017). The beyond-the-self dimension of adolescent purpose: Absence and change. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 558-570. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1209543

Reis, H. T., O'Keefe, S. D., & Lane, R. D. (2017). Fun is more fun when others are involved. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 547-557. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221123

Sanford, K., Kruse, M. I., Proctor, A., Torres, V. A., Pennington, M. L., Synett, S. J., & Gulliver, S. B. (2017). Couple resilience and life wellbeing in firefighters. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 660-666. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2017.1291852

Searle, J. R. (1995). *Construction of Social Reality*. London: Free Press.

Shapiro, S. (2000). *Thinking About Mathematics: The Philosophy of Mathematics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siegel, J. T., & Thomson, A. L. (2017). Positive emotion infusions of elevation and gratitude: Increasing help-seeking intentions among people with heightened levels of depressive symptomatology. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 509-524. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221125

Southwell, S., & Gould, E. (2017). A randomised wait list-controlled pre–post–follow-up trial of a gratitude diary with a distressed sample. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 579-593. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1221127

Stefanowitsch, A. (2004). Happiness in English and German: A Metaphorical-pattern Analysis'. In K. Achard & S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture, and Mind* (pp. 137-149). Stanford: CSLI.

Tang, Y.-Y., Ma, Y., Wang, J., Fan, Y., Feng, S., Lu, Q., . . . Posner, M. I. (2007). Short-term meditation training improves attention and self-regulation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104*(43), 17152-17156. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0707678104

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli1501_01

Thomson, A. L., & Siegel, J. T. (2017). Elevation: A review of scholarship on a moral and other-praising emotion. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(6), 628-638. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1269184

Vekas, E. J., & Wade, T. D. (2017). The impact of a universal intervention targeting perfectionism in children: An exploratory controlled trial. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 458-473. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12152

Villalobos, B. T., Ullman, J., Krick, T. W., Alcántara, D., Kopelowicz, A., & López, S. R. (2017). Caregiver criticism, help-giving, and the burden of schizophrenia among Mexican American families. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(3), 273-285. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12137

Wadman, R., Clarke, D., Sayal, K., Armstrong, M., Harroe, C., Majumder, P., . . . Townsend, E. (2017). A sequence analysis of patterns in self-harm in young people with and without experience of being looked after in care. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 388-407. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12145

Waite, J., Rose, J., Wilde, L., Eden, K., Stinton, C., Moss, J., & Oliver, C. (2017). Associations between behaviours that challenge in adults with intellectual disability, parental perceptions and parental mental health. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 408-430. doi: 10.1111/bjc.12146

Wapner, S., Werner, H., & Krus, D. M. (1957). The effect of success and failure on space localization. *Journal of Personality, 25*(6), 752-756.

Wilber, K. (1997). An integral theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 4*(1), 71-92.

Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical Expressions of Anger and Happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 10*(2), 59-92. doi: 10.1207/s15327868ms1002_1

Table 1. Articles analysed

Journal	Authors	Title
JOPP	Bell et al.	The promotion of self-forgiveness, responsibility, and willingness to make reparations through a workbook intervention
	Chen and Chang	Sport-domain gratitude uniquely accounts for athletes' well-being across two cultures: Incremental validity above the general gratitude
	George and Park	The Multidimensional Existential Meaning Scale: A tripartite approach to measuring meaning in life
	Krause et al.	General feelings of gratitude, gratitude to god, and hemoglobin A1c: Exploring variations by gender
	Malouff and Schutte	Can psychological interventions increase optimism? A meta-analysis
	Palgi et al.	Changes in positive and negative affect as predictors of change in felt age: Results from the Health and Retirement Study
	Passmore and Holder	Noticing nature: Individual and social benefits of a two-week intervention
	Petrocchi et al.	Compassion at the mirror: Exposure to a mirror increases the efficacy of a self-compassion manipulation in enhancing soothing positive affect and heart rate variability
	Quinn	The beyond-the-self dimension of adolescent purpose: Absence and change
	Reis et al.	Fun is more fun when others are involved
	Sanford et al.	Couple resilience and life wellbeing in firefighters
	Siegal and Thompson	Positive emotion infusions of elevation and gratitude: Increasing help-seeking intentions among people with heightened levels of depressive symptomatology
	Southwell and Gould	A randomised wait list-controlled pre–post–follow-up trial of a gratitude diary with a distressed sample
	Thomson and Siegel	Elevation: A review of scholarship on a moral and other-praising emotion
BJCP	Belchev et al.	Psychological traits predict impaired awareness of deficits independently of neuropsychological factors in chronic traumatic brain injury
	Brooks et al.	Rumination, event centrality, and perceived control as predictors of post-traumatic growth and distress: The Cognitive Growth and Stress model
	Dingle et al.	Choir singing and creative writing enhance emotion regulation in adults with chronic mental health conditions
	Dodd et al.	Psychological mechanisms and the ups and downs of personal recovery in bipolar disorder
	Ellett et al.	Distress, omnipotence, and responsibility beliefs in command hallucinations
	Fornells-Ambrojo	Experiences of outcome monitoring in service users with psychosis: Findings from an Improving Access to Psychological Therapies for people with Severe Mental Illness (IAPT-SMI) demonstration site
	Johnson et al.	A path model of different forms of impulsivity with externalizing and internalizing psychopathology: Towards greater specificity
	Langdon et al.	Impairments of spontaneous and deliberative mentalizing co-occur, yet dissociate, in schizophrenia
	Miller et al.	On the reciprocal effects between multiple group identifications and mental health: A longitudinal study of Scottish adolescents
	Psychogiou et al.	Does fathers' and mothers' rumination predict emotional symptoms in their children?
	Vekas and Wade	The impact of a universal intervention targeting perfectionism in children: An exploratory controlled trial
	Villalobos	Caregiver criticism, help-giving, and the burden of schizophrenia among Mexican American families
	Wadman et al.	A sequence analysis of patterns in self-harm in young people with and without experience of being looked after in care
	Waite et al.	Associations between behaviours that challenge in adults with intellectual disability, parental perceptions and parental mental health

Table 2. Verticality

Value		Conceptual				Experiential				Methodological				Statistical				Outcomes				Total			
		+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t
Base	PP	18		6	24	9	1		10	14		44	58	2		6	8	16	5	16	37	59	6	72	137
	CP	19		23	42		1		1	2		62	64			38	38	2		31	33	23	1	154	178
	t	37		29	66	9	2		11	16		106	122	2		44	46	18	5	47	70	**82**	**7**	**226**	**315**
Bottom	PP			2	2																			2	2
	CP			3	3																			3	3
	t			5	5																			5	5
Low	PP	2	3		5	9	8	11	28	1		2	3		4	2	6	22	14	26	62	34	29	41	104
	CP	8	4		12	7	12		19			4	4			19	19	10	11	2	23	25	27	25	77
	t	10	7		17	16	20	11	47	1		6	7	0	4	21	25	32	25	28	85	**59**	**56**	**66**	**181**
Below	PP											10	10		1		1						1	10	11
	CP											1	1	1	4	4	9	1			1	2	4	5	11
	t											11	11	1	5	4	10	1			1	**2**	**5**	**15**	**22**
Down	PP	1		3	4		4		4			6	6			1	1					1	4	10	15
	CP		1	1	2		4		4		4	1	5						3		3		12	2	14
	t	1	1	4	6		8		8		4	7	11			1			3			**1**	**16**	**12**	**29**
Depress	PP	17	30	20	67	14	46	8	68	2	17	4	23					31	37	14	82	64	130	46	240
	CP	1	76		77	6	78		84		33		33		6		6	7	91		98	14	284		298
	t	18	106	20	144	20	124	8	152	2	50	4	56		6		6	38	128	14	180	**78**	**414**	**46**	**538**
Fall	PP		1	3	4		3		3														1	6	7
	CP		1		1	1	1		2							1	1		3		3	1	5	1	7
	t		2	3	5	1	4		5							1	1		3		3	**1**	**6**	**7**	**14**
Under	PP	7	6	3	16		3		3			12	12						3		3	7	12	15	34
	CP	12	10	6	28	1	5	23	29			7	7	2	1	1	4	2	12	3	17	17	28	33	88
	t	19	16	9	44	1	8	23	32			19	19	2	1	1	4	2	15	3	20	**24**	**40**	**48**	**112**
Short	PP	3	1		4		1		1	3	1	6	10							1	1	6	3	7	16
	CP			1	1		2		2	5		11	16						1		1	5	3	12	20
	t	3	1	1	5		3		3	8	1	17	26						1	1	1	**11**	**6**	**19**	**36**
Rise	PP	2		2	4	2		2	4		1		1					1		1	2	5	1	5	11
	CP					3	4		7	1												4	4		8
	t					5	4	2	11	1	1		1					1		1	2	**9**	**5**	**5**	**19**
Lift	PP	4			4	4			4									2			2	10			10
	CP					1			1													1			1
	t	4			4	5			5									2			2	**1**			**11**

Elevate	PP	165	4		169	130	5	3	138	30			30	6			6	21	5		29	352	14	3	369
	CP					1	4	1	6										3		3	1	7	1	9
	t	165	4		169	131	9	4	144	30			30	6			6	21	8		29	**353**	**21**	**4**	**378**
Up	PP	14		2	16	16	2		18	1		53	54	3	1	7	11	3			3	37	3	62	102
	CP	3	2	10	15	2	5	2	9		3	23	26	1	8	1	10	3	1	12	16	9	19	48	76
	t	17	2	12	31	18	7	2	27	1	3	76	80	4	9	8	21	6	1	12	19	**46**	**22**	**110**	**178**
Above	PP	2			2	3	2		5			18	18			2	2	8	2		10	13	4	20	37
	CP					1			1			8	8	5	2	3	10					6	2	11	19
	t	2			2	4	2		6			26	26	5	2	5	12	8	2		10	**19**	**6**	**31**	**56**
Over	PP	35	5	9	49	8	4	5	17	4		25	29		2	3	5	9	2	25	36	56	13	67	136
	CP	25	14	13	52	15	20	3	38	3	1	48	52		4	6	10	17	16	17	50	65	55	89	209
	t	60	19	22	101	23	24	8	55	7	1	73	81		6	9	15	26	18	42	86	**116**	**68**	**154**	**338**
High	PP	41	7	5	53	30	4	5	39	3		4	7	9	4	3	16	67	14	3	84	150	29	20	199
	CP	41	29	8	78	27	14	1	42	10	6	14	30	4	5	9	18	38	34	5	77	120	88	37	245
	t	82	36	13	131	57	18	6	81	13	6	18	37	13	9	12	34	105	48	8	161	**269**	**117**	**57**	**444**
Top	PP	1		4	5							2	2									1		6	7
	CP			1	1	1			1													1		1	2
	t	1		5	6	1			1			2	2									**2**		**7**	**9**
Peak	PP											3	3											3	3
	CP																	2			2	2			2
	t											3	3					2			2	**2**		**3**	**5**

Note. + = positive valence; - = negative valence; n = neutral valence; t = total; PP = Journal of Positive Psychology; CP = British Journal of Clinical Psychology

Table 3. Horizontality

Value		Conceptual				Experiential				Methodological				Statistical				Outcomes				Total			
		+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t
Close	PP	16	3	1	20	7			7	18		2	20	7		2	9	10			10	58	3	5	66
	CP		1	1	2	1	1		2			1	1									1	2	2	5
	t	16	4	2	22	8	1		9	18		3	21	7		2	9	10			10	**57**	**5**	**6**	**71**
Near	PP			2	2	1	1		2			2	2			3	3					1	1	7	9
	CP										1	2	2	2			2					2	1	2	5
	t			2	2	1	1		2		1	4	5	2		3	5					**3**	**2**	**9**	**14**
Far	PP	1	2	2	5		1		1			2	2									1	3	4	8
	CP																								
	t	1	2	2	5		1		1			2	2									**1**	**3**	**4**	**8**
Narrow	PP					2			2													2			2
	CP						1		1														1		1
	t					2	1		3													**2**	**1**		**3**
Broad	PP	11		6	17	12		1	13	7		3	10									30		10	40
	CP	2	5		7	1			1					1			1		2		2	4	5	2	11
	t	13	5	6	24	13		1	14	7		3	10	1			1		2		2	**34**	**5**	**12**	**51**
Wide	PP	4		1	5	5	1		6	5		3	8					2			2	16	1	4	21
	CP	3	1	1	5	1	3		4	8	1	2	11	1		1	2	3		2	5	16	5	6	26
	t	7	1	2	10	6	4		10	13	1	5	19	1		1	2	5		2	7	**32**	**6**	**10**	**48**
Centre	PP			1	1					1		9	10			3	3					1		13	14
	CP	3			3						2	7	9									3	2	7	12
	t	3		1	4					1	2	16	19			3	3					**4**	**2**	**20**	**26**
Back	PP	2	1	1	4	4	4	1	9			2	2									6	5	3	14
	CP	8		2	10	2	1	2	5	10		4	14					11			11	33	1	6	40
	t	10	1	3	13	6	5	3	14	10		6	16					11			11	**39**	**6**	**9**	**54**
Front	PP											10	10											10	10
	CP			2	2		1		1														1	2	3
	t			2	2		1		1			10	10										**1**	**12**	**13**

Note. + = positive valence; - = negative valence; n = neutral valence; t = total; PP = Journal of Positive Psychology; CP = British Journal of Clinical Psychology

Table 4. Configuration

Value		Conceptual				Experiential				Methodological				Statistical				Outcomes				Total			
		+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t
Dimension	PP	40	5	25	70	26		4	30	26	3	2	31	3	2	8	13	18		9	27	113	10	48	171
	CP	1		8	9					1		1	2			2	2					2		11	13
	t	41	5	33	79	26		4	30	27	3	3	33	3	2	10	15	18		9	27	**115**	**10**	**59**	**184**
Domain	PP	3		4	7			6	6			1	1									3		11	14
	CP			17	17	1			1			4	4							14	14	1		35	36
	t	3		21	24	1		6	7			5	5							14	14	**4**		**46**	**50**
Limit	PP		11	2	13	1	1		2	1	30	3	34			2	2					2	42	7	51
	CP		1		1	1			1		44		44		6	2	8	1			1	2	51	2	55
	t		12	2	14	2	1		3	1	74	3	78		6	4	10	1			1	**4**	**93**	**9**	**106**
Small	PP					1	1		2	1	2	3	6	3	15	3	21		2		2	5	20	6	31
	CP		1		1					1	6	7	14		6	1	7					1	13	8	22
	t		1		1	1	1		2	2	8	10	20	3	21	4	28		2		2	**6**	**33**	**7**	**53**
Grow	PP	7			7	8	3		11	1			1					2			2	18	3		21
	CP	14			14	11			11							10	10	16			16	41		10	51
	t	21			21	19	3		22	1			1			10	10	18			18	**59**	**3**	**10**	**72**
Expand	PP	6			6							1	1	1			1	1			1	8		1	9
	CP	3			3					2			2									5			5
	t	9			9					2		1	3	1			1	1			1	**13**		**1**	**14**
Large	PP	3		2	5	7			7	6		2	8	14			14	7			7	37		4	41
	CP	3	1		4			1	1	17	1	7	25	10	3	1	14	2	2		4	32	7	9	48
	t	6	1	2	9	7		1	8	23	1	9	33	24	3	1	28	9	2		11	**69**	**7**	**13**	**89**
Long	PP	4		2	6	7	1		8	11		13	24	2		3	5	8	2		10	32	3	18	53
	CP	1	1		4	1	6	2	9	5		31	36					4	1	4	9	11	8	37	56
	t	5	1	2	8	8	7	2	17	16		44	60	2		3	5	12	3	4	19	**43**	**11**	**55**	**109**
Great	PP	5	1	1	7	16	2		18	4		1	5	3		2	5	9			9	37	3	4	44
	CP	8	9	1	18	15	11		26	1	3		4	1			1	22	16	3	41	47	39	4	90
	t	13	10	2	25	31	13		44	5	3	1	9	4		2	6	31	16	3	50	**84**	**42**	**8**	**134**
Internal	PP	1			1			3	3	1		2	3	10		4	14					12		9	21
	CP	3	2		5	10	8	6	24			1	1	16			16	4	11	4	19	33	21	11	65
	t	4	2		6	10	8	9	27	1		3	4	26		4	30	4	11	4	19	**45**	**20**	**19**	**86**
Within	PP	2		6	8	1		3	4			23	23			6	6			1	1	3		39	42
	CP			1	1	6			6	2		21	23	3		6	9	1	1	1	3	12	1	29	42
	t	2		7	9	7		3	10	2		44	46	3		12	15	1	1	2	4	**15**	**1**	**68**	**84**

Outside	PP			1	1	3		1	4											3		2	5
	CP							1	1			1	1									2	2
	t			1	1	3		2	5			1	1							**3**		**4**	**7**
External	PP					5	1		6	2			2							7	1		8
	CP	1	3	6	10		4		4		2	2	4				2		2	1	11	8	20
	t	1	3	6	10	5	5		10	2	2	2	6				2		2	**8**	**12**	**8**	**28**
Beyond	PP	30	5	1	36	63	10		73	2	1		3	1	1	2	58	11	69	154	27	2	183
	CP	1			1	1	1	1	3	1	1	4	6							3	2	5	10
	t	31	5	1	37	64	11	1	76	3	2	4	9	1	1	2	58	11	69	**157**	**29**	**7**	**193**
Separate	PP			5	5		1		1			23	23	1	3	4			1	1	1	1	32	34
	CP		2		2							8	8		7	7					2	15	17
	t		2	5	7		1		1			31	31	1	10	11			1	1	**1**	**3**	**47**	**51**
Full	PP	63	7		70	74	16		90	20		7	27	2	1	3	56	8		64	215	31	8	254
	CP	29	15	3	47	22	11		33		1	4	5		2	2	27	14	1	42	78	41	10	129
	t	92	22	3	117	96	27		123	20	1	11	32	2	3	5	83	22	1	106	**293**	**72**	**18**	**383**

Note. + = positive valence; - = negative valence; n = neutral valence; t = total; PP = Journal of Positive Psychology; CP = British Journal of Clinical Psychology

Table 5. Dynamism

Value		Conceptual				Experiential				Methodological				Statistical				Outcomes				Total			
		+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t	+	-	n	t
Move	PP	8			8	25			25			2	2		3	3	6	14	3		17	47	6	5	58
	CP							1	1			5	5		12		12						12	6	18
	t	8			8	25		1	26			7	7		15	3	18	14	3		17	**47**	**18**	**11**	**76**
Direction	PP	2		1	3	4			4	6	4		10	3	3	2	8	3			3	18	7	3	28
	CP	2		2	4	1			1	5			5	3	1	1	5	2		2	4	13	1	5	19
	t	4		3	7	5			5	11	4		15	6	4	3	13	5		2	7	**31**	**8**	**8**	**47**
Approach	PP	23		4	27	3	1	1	5	25	2	4	31	1		1	2	1			1	53	3	10	66
	CP	8		1	9	2	1		3	8		3	11	2			2	1			1	21	1	4	26
	t	31		5	36	5	2	1	8	33	2	7	42	3		1	4	2			2	**74**	**4**	**14**	**92**
Toward	PP	5			5	39	6	2	47	1		3	4	1			1	4			4	50	6	5	61
	CP	3	1	1	5	8	7		15	4	1	2	7			1	1	4	3		7	19	12	4	35
	t	8	1	1	10	47	13	2	62	5	1	5	11	1		1	2	8	3		11	**69**	**18**	**9**	**96**
Enter	PP							2	2			16	16											18	18
	CP					1	2	1	4			8	8									1	2	9	12
	t					1	2	3	6			24	24									**1**	**2**	**27**	**30**
Withdraw	PP						2		2														2		2
	CP						4		4		2	1	3										6	1	7
	t						6		6		2	1	3										**8**	**1**	**9**
Away	PP											1	1											1	1
	CP						2	1	3			1	1										2	2	4
	t						2	1	3			2	2										**2**	**3**	**5**
Through	PP	5			5	9	1	1	11	2		14	16	6		3	9	2			2	24	1	18	43
	CP	8	2	2	12	7	4	3	14	2	4	7	13	3	3	2	8	8	7		15	28	20	14	62
	t	13	2	2	17	16	5	4	25	4	4	21	29	9	3	5	17	10	7		17	**50**	**21**	**32**	**105**
Around	PP					4		1	5			1	1			1	1					4		3	7
	CP			1	1	1	1	1	3			5	5			1	1			2	2	1	1	10	12
	t			1	1	5	1	2	8			6	6			2	2			2	2	**5**	**2**	**13**	**19**
Leave	PP					2			2			6	6									2		6	8
	CP							4	4															4	4
	t					2		4	6			6	6									**2**		**10**	**12**
Return	PP									4	7	13	24					3	3	2	8	7	10	15	32
	CP											1	1			1	1							2	2
	t									4	7	14	25			1	1	3	3	2	8	**7**	**10**	**17**	**34**

Note. + = positive valence; - = negative valence; n = neutral valence; t = total; PP = Journal of Positive Psychology; CP = British Journal of Clinical Psychology